

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 9, 2007.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Objections/Rejections**

The Specification was objected to as requiring the inclusion of section (h), Brief Description of the Drawings.

Claims 6-10 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-10.

Claims 6-10 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 10/784,600.

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bogle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,923 B1).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Response**

The claims were amended to better define embodiments of Applicants' invention, canceling claims 6-10 and adding new claims 11-21, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 11-21. Since claims 6-10 were canceled, the rejections in the office action are moot. To expedite prosecution, an argument is presented below as to why the prior art references cited in the office action do not disclose new claims 11-21. A drawing was added and the specification was amended in response to the examiner's objections, but no new matter is added. A terminal disclaimer is attached to overcome the rejection for non-statutory double patenting.

### **III. The Prior Art References Do Not Disclose Claims 11-21**

Independent Claim 11 states:

A system for debugging in more than one programming language, comprising:  
a multi-language debugger with the capability to debug a source code file with multiple, nested, compiled and interpreted languages;  
a script engine interface, wherein a script engine communicates with the debugger through the script engine interface;  
a debuggable frame object, wherein the script engine uses a debuggable frame

object to retrieve script context for a language;  
an interface to a messaging environment, wherein the interface is implemented  
by a runtime messaging environment that controls a running state of the script engine;  
a debug commands interface; and  
a script debug controller.

New independent claim 11 defines an architecture for a system for debugging in more than one programming language. The multi-language debugger of claim 11 has the ability to interpret multiple languages within a single source file, including both compiled and interpreted languages. The debugger communicates with a script engine through a script engine interface. The script engine uses a debuggable frame object to retrieve script context information for a language. Additional components in the architecture include an interface to a runtime messaging environment, a debug commands interface, and a script debug controller.

Bogle teaches an active debugging environment for debugging a virtual application that contains program language code from multiple compiled and interpreted languages. Bogle's focus is on debugging a virtual application that has components from several programming languages. Bogle's invention does not appear to be intended to address the same problem that Applicants faced, namely debugging a single source code file with multiple interpreted and compiled languages nested within one another. While there are some similarities in the solutions developed by Bogle and Applicants, the fact that they had different problems to solve resulted in different inventions.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 11 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Bogle. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 11, dependent Claims 12-21 are also patentable. Dependent claims 12-21 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

#### IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800